Bernadotte E. Schmitt
The University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

THE

MINORITY QUESTION IN TRANSYLVANIA

IRMA
Book

D
651
.T8
M5

BUCAREST

—

GOVERNMENT PRESS

1925

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY
1857
and gladly would he learn and gladly teach

[redacted]

DEMCO

The person charging this material is responsible for its return to the Library on or before the **Latest Date** stamped below.

Theft, mutilation, and underlining of books are reasons for disciplinary action and may result in dismissal from the University.

MAR 1 0 1995

MIN NIA

BUCAREST

GOVERNMENT PRESS

1925

[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted]
ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY
1857
and gladly would he learn and gladly teach
[redacted]
DEMCO

ble for its
st Date

THE

MINORITY QUESTION IN TRANSYLVANIA

BUCAREST

—

GOVERNMENT PRESS

1925

D
651
.T8
M5

THE MINORITY QUESTION IN TRANSYLVANIA

INTRODUCTION

Transylvania and the neighbouring districts, joined on to Roumania after the world's war, cover an area of 101.200 sq: kil: having a population of 5, 113, 124 inhabitants.

Out of which

2.930.120	or 57.50%	are Roumanians.
1.305.753	» 25.53%	» Magyars and Sicules.
534.427	» 10.45%	» Germans (Saxons and Souabes).
584.340	» 3.60%	» Jews.
158.484	» 2.92%	Other nationalities (Ruthenes, Serbes, Bulgars, etc.).
5.113.124	100	

Calculating by districts the population of Transylvania appears as follows.

TABLE No. 1

DISTRICTS	Total Number of inhabitants calculated by Districts	NUMBER OF INHABITANTS BY NATIONALITIES									
		Roumanians	Percentage out of the whole population	Magyars	Percentage out of the whole population	Germans	Percentage out of the whole population	Jews	Percentage out of the whole population	Other nationalities	Percentage out of the whole population
Alba-de-Jos	214.962	173.106	80.50	29.847	13.97	7.143	3.27	3.562	1.65	1.204	0.61
Arad	397.969	245.113	61.59	98.208	24.73	31.524	7.97	7.822	1.96	15.302	3.75
Bihor	489.680	275.831	56.32	172.855	35.29	1.984	0.40	29.028	5.92	9.982	2.07
Bistrița-Năsăud	120 479	85.053	70.59	4.945	4.10	20.506	17.02	6.856	5.68	3.119	2.61
Brașov	101.953	36.138	35.46	33 594	32.94	30.281	29.70	1.560	1.53	390	0.31
Caraș-Severin	424.264	316.315	74.55	18.948	4.46	52.576	12.39	3.765	0.88	32.660	7.22
Cojocna	307.052	191.818	62.50	89.987	29.30	7.746	2.52	14.409	4.69	3.093	0.99
Ciuc	140.199	28.382	20.24	108.978	77.73	285	0.20	1.861	1.32	693	0.41
Făgăraș	93.916	86.355	91.95	3.975	4.23	2.835	3 01	560	0.59	191	0.31
Hunedoara	320.428	262.569	81.94	39.978	12.16	8.521	2 69	4.656	1.45	4.704	1.76
Maramureș	152.695	82.778	54.21	13.956	9.13	3.066	2.08	36.535	23.92	16.360	10.66
Mureș-Turda	219.051	87.547	39.96	115.843	52.56	6.320	2 88	7.551	3.48	2.681	1.12
Odorheiu	119.385	4.675	3.91	111.345	93.26	1.957	1.63	1.025	0.85	383	0.35
Sălaj	236 378	139.522	61.63	70.744	31.25	831	0.26	9.356	4.13	5.925	2.63
Sătmar	299.791	162.067	54.05	76.893	25.68	36.250	12.09	22.365	7.46	2.216	0.72
Sibiu	175.515	112.720	64.23	5.758	3.28	51.856	29.54	1.460	0.83	3.721	2.13
Solnoc-Dobâca	207.831	183.875	77.30	37.436	15.74	1.781	0.74	12.506	5.25	2 241	0.77
Târnava-Mică	113.566	57.801	50.89	31.392	27.64	20.372	17.93	1.785	1.57	2 216	1.97
Târnava-Mare	148.864	67.612	45.41	16.187	10.87	63 819	42.87	0.966	0.64	280	0.21
Timiș-Torontal	488.729	172.277	35.04	69.207	14.16	184.129	37.67	10.295	2.10	47.821	1.03
Trei-Scaune	144.905	28.965	19.98	114.168	78.78	429	0.29	848	0.58	495	0.37
Turda-Arieș	175.612	129 611	73.80	41.517	23.64	208	0.11	2.569	1.46	1.707	0.99
	5.113.224	2.930.120	57.50	1.305.753	25.53	534.427	10.45	184.340	3.60	158.484	2.99

From this schedule it stands out that the Roumanians have an absolute majority in 15 districts (out of 22) namely:

Alba de Jos 30.50 %, Arad 61.59%, Bihor 56.32%, Bistrița Năsăud 70.59%, Caraș Severin 74 55%, Cojocna 62.50%, Fagaraș 91.95%, Hunedoara 81.94%, Maramureș 54.2% Salaj 61.63%, Satu Mare 54.05%, Sibiu 64.22%, Solnoc-Dobâca 77.30%, Tarnava Mică 50.89%, Turda-Arieș 73.80%.

They have a relative majority in two districts: Brașov 35.44% Roumanians to, 32.94% Magyars and 29.70% Saxons; and Târnava Mare 45.41% Roumanians to 10.37 Magyars and 42.87% Saxons.

The Magyars have an absolute majority in four districts:

Ciuc 77.73%, Mureș Turda 52.56%, Odorheiu 42.87%, and Trei Scaune 78.78%.

The Germans have neither an absolute nor a relative majority in any district.

Therefore we see that the Magyars form a compact mass of 450.334 inhabitants only in the center of the country (the districts of Ciuc, Odorheiu, Trei Scaune, and a part of the district of Mures-Turda, where they represent 52.56% to 39.96% Roumanians, 2.88% Saxons 3.48% Jews aud 1.12%, other nationalities) whereas the rest of 853.419 Magyars are dispersed over the other 18 districts.

The following table will show how they are divided over these 18 districts.

TABLE No. 2

Order No.	DISTRICTS	MAGYAR INHABITANTS																	
		1-25	25-50	50-75	75-100	100-200	2-300	3-400	4-500	5 600	6-700	7-800	8-900	9-1.000	1.000-1.500	1.500-2.000	2.000-2.500	Above 2.500	Total
1	Alba-de-Jos ..	43	11	5	5	12	6	4	5	5	3	2	1	1	3	—	1	—	107
2	Arad	68	17	12	3	14	9	1	2	3	2	2	3	2	6	9	3	2	158
3	Bihor	127	19	15	11	22	10	8	3	10	8	5	5	6	24	10	2	8	293
4	Bistrița-Năsăud ..	41	4	1	—	2	3	—	1	—	1	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	55
5	Caraș-Severin	152	12	11	3	6	8	4	—	1	1	—	—	—	3	2	—	—	203
6	Cojocna	45	21	17	7	18	12	8	5	13	5	3	—	5	10	1	1	—	171
7	Brașov	1	2	4	—	4	2	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	4	3	1	1	23
8	Făgăraș	32	3	—	1	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	39
9	Hunedoara...	100	18	11	7	7	3	5	3	—	2	2	1	—	2	—	—	4	165
10	Maramureș ..	27	1	2	—	1	3	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	1	—	39
11	Sălaj.....	72	14	5	4	20	9	8	8	—	—	—	—	—	7	4	2	3	156
12	Sătmar.....	60	15	9	1	13	9	15	6	8	8	4	5	1	2	2	2	—	161
13	Sibiu.....	30	5	2	2	1	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	42
14	Solnoc-Dobâca	79	23	12	5	20	4	5	9	4	—	2	4	2	3	1	—	1	174
15	Târnava-Mare	66	10	6	3	6	3	1	2	—	1	1	2	—	2	2	—	—	105
16	Târnava-Mică	29	13	5	2	5	7	7	7	3	2	5	1	5	3	1	—	—	95
17	Timiș-Torontal	69	38	24	14	24	14	6	7	6	3	4	1	2	6	2	2	—	222
18	Turda-Arieș..	33	7	—	2	12	5	5	2	4	5	2	2	—	6	2	—	1	88
		1074	234	142	170	186	108	79	62	57	45	32	26	25	84	41	15	20	2.296

Comune

As we see these 853.419, Magyars are dispersed over 2.296 localities. In 1.704 of these, that is, almost in half, the number of Magyars varies between 1 and 25 inhabitants, in 446 localities it varies from 25 to 100, in 455 from 100—500 in 181 from 500—1.000, and only in 160 localities their number exceeds 1.000.

In order to realize still more fully the manner in which the minorities are distributed in Transylvania and the adjoining districts, we join hereunto a table of the circumscriptions in which we may see the percentage of Roumanians, of Magyars and of Germans.

TABLE No. 3

Order No.	DISTRICTS	No.	CIRCUMSCRIPTION	Roumanians	Magyars	Germans
1	Alba-de-Jos	1	Abrud	95.13	4.60	0.01
		2	Aiud	80.96	18.87	0.02
		3	Blaj	78.35	9.09	8.63
		4	Ighiu	93.52	4.80	0.28
		5	Ocna-Mureşului	66.83	30.40	0.19
		6	Ocna-Sibiului	83.47	2.25	13.72
		7	Teiuş	88.80	9.97	0.15
		8	Vinţul-de-Jos	93.26	2.87	3.49
2	Arad	1	Arad	45.05	25.98	27.60
		2	Chişinău	68.02	25.93	3.72
		3	Hălmagiu	98.50	0.78	0.32
		4	Ineu	86.90	10.48	0.64
		5	Pecica	39.08	33.52	5.50
		6	Radna	89.04	6.00	3.74
		7	Sebiş	90.62	6.38	0.91
		8	Siria	58.47	13.97	26.16
		9	Târnova	93.61	5.63	0.28
3	Bihor	1	Aleşd	79.80	10.26	0.34
		2	Beiuş	83.48	14.07	0.11
		3	Beliu	94.47	4.22	0.29
		4	Cefa	87.68	7.89	0.03
		5	Ceica	95.79	3.07	0.09
		6	Centrala	51.63	44.94	1.27
		7	Marghita	42.72	39.96	0.43
		8	Mihaifalău	26.67	64.87	0.17
		9	Săcheihid	8.04	87.47	0.03
		10	Sălard	45.84	51.36	0.23
		11	Salo ta	34.54	62.48	0.14
		12	Tinca	74.03	24.27	0.05
		13	Vaşcău	96.90	1.74	0.24
4	Bistriţa-Năsăud	1	Beşinea	59.27	7.79	23.19
		2	Iad	59.84	0.67	3.43
		3	Năsăud	88.14	4.09	0.05
		4	Rodna-Veche	91.02	1.04	2.68
5	Braşov	1	Bârsa-de-Jos	40.58	18.18	40.60
		2	Bârsa-de-Sus	40	7	52
		3	Săcele	36	62	2
6	Caraş-Severin	1	Lugoj	76.34	0.86	7.25
		2	Begheiu	73.06	23.03	3.35
		3	Bichiş	96.56	2.24	0.51
		4	Bocşa-Montană	79.16	5.29	10.98
		5	Bozovici	95.37	0.23	—
		6	Caransebeş	91.40	0.52	2.29
		7	Făget	82.72	13.50	2.60
		8	Moldova-Nouă	46.62	0.71	1.79

Order No.	DISTRICTS	No.	CIRCUMSCRIPTION	Roumanians	Magyars	Germans
		9	Oravița-Montană . .	65.49	1.83	29.83
		10	Orșova	73.40	3.19	14.46
		11	Răcășdia	97.48	0.15	1.05
		12	Reșița	52.18	3.09	27.62
		13	Terezova	89.53	0.41	9.29
		14	Timiș	74.17	2.60	10.59
7	Ciuc	1	Ghimeș	20.06	7.87	0.12
		2	Gheorgheni	14.15	83.69	0.23
		3	Mercurea-Ciuc . . .	14.20	85.51	0.03
		4	Sânmartin	16.2	83.08	0.19
		5	Tulgheș	68.55	27.65	0.28
8	Cojocna	1	Borșa	80.91	17.85	0.01
		2	Cluj	62.49	35.32	0.12
		3	Cojocna	70.82	27.99	0.10
		4	Gilău	74.34	24.19	0.05
		5	Hida	85.39	10.93	—
		6	Huedin	77.59	19.81	0.14
		7	Ormeniș	85.44	12.99	0.08
		8	Sărmaș	74.24	19.46	0.18
		9	Mociu	65.60	31.26	0.03
		10	Teaca	59.41	12.03	24.89
9	Făgăraș	1	Arpașul-de-Jos . . .	95.01	1.63	2.70
		2	Bran	86.57	2.05	1.03
		3	Făgăraș	98.72	0.91	0.12
		4	Șercaia	94.17	2.13	3.85
10	Hunedoara	1	Baia de-Criș	96.72	1.96	9.62
		2	Brad	93.71	3.73	1.56
		3	Deva	81.04	16.52	1.54
		4	Geoagiul-de-Jos . .	96.95	16.55	0.17
		5	Hațeg	94.84	3.54	0.44
		6	Hunedoara	87.55	8.49	3.18
		7	Ilia	96.99	17.3	0.30
		8	Orăștie	92.19	5.12	2.54
		9	Petroșeni	51.81	32.74	6.77
		10	Pui	96.71	2.43	0.17
11	Maramureș	1	Dragomirești . . .	81.02	0.27	0.08
		2	Sighet	31.76	19.81	0.45
		3	Sugătag	83.46	4.98	0.01
		4	Vișcu	49.68	2.63	5.52
12	Mureș-Turda	1	Bandul-de-Câmp . .	52.19	44.87	0.01
		2	Murăș-de-Jos . . .	28.68	68.93	0.08
		3	Murăș-de-Sus . . .	42.83	54.19	0.13
		4	Reghinul-de-Jos . .	66.08	29.88	2.97
		5	Reghinul-de-Sus . .	65.19	23.78	5.94
		6	Sereda	10.50	85.90	0.15

Order No.	DISTRICTS	No.	CIRCUMSCRIPTION	Roumanians	Magyars	Germans
13	Odorheiu	1	Cristur	6.41	88.90	1.95
		2	Ocland	7.44	89.50	2.58
		3	Odorheiu	1.18	97.08	1.42
		4	Praid	0.20	98.83	0.01
14	Sălaj	1	Cheiul-Silvaniei	68.15	25.76	1.42
		2	Crasna	70.44	18.66	0.01
		3	Jibou	85.44	11.52	0.01
		4	Șimleul-Silvaniei	49.32	41.40	0.16
		5	Tășnad	54.75	38.55	0.24
		6	Zălau	66.38	30.55	0.01
15	Sătmar	1	Arded	53.11	14.10	29.57
		2	Baia-Mare	86.30	8.22	0.01
		3	Careii Mari	33.05	26.01	36.25
		4	Dașim	61.45	14.10	—
		5	Sătmar	49.69	34.84	10.44
		6	Seini	78.95	10.85	3.24
		7	Șoneuța-Mare	87.65	5.57	3.66
		8	Ugocea	56.51	28.88	4.45
16	Sibiu	1	Cisnădia	77.65	1.95	19.35
		2	Mercurea	75.37	0.36	22.42
		3	Nocrich	59.97	2.61	31.58
		4	Sebeșul-Săsesc	86.67	0.24	12.02
		5	Sălișle	98.77	0.28	0.66
		6	Sibiu	46.02	0.50	48.10
17	Solnoc-Dobâca	1	Beclean	71.19	18.24	4.05
		2	Cheuchiș	70.04	25.75	0.76
		3	Ciachi-Gărbou	94.25	2.28	0.06
		4	Dej	79.19	14.99	0.02
		5	Gherla	75.03	22.36	0.01
		6	Ileanda Mare	94.43	1.66	0.02
		7	Lăpușul-Ung	82.86	12.69	0.13
		8	Mănăstur	93.89	0.51	0.05
18	Târnava-Mare	1	Agnita	54.85	3.52	41.69
		2	Cincu-Mare	53.85	6.17	39.76
		3	Cohalm	48.05	22.39	29.06
		4	Mediaș	44.89	4.98	49.08
		5	Sighișoara	41.39	7.02	51.59
19	Târnava-Mică	1	Dicio-Sânmărtin	41.54	40.27	12.36
		2	Hususău	62.04	10.98	25.39
		3	Pășfalău	42.49	36.20	19.03
		4	Iermut	69.72	26.82	—
20	Timiș-Torontal	1	Aradul-Nou	26.10	6.91	59.18
		2	Buziaș	64.74	14.87	17.66
		3	Centrala	32.7	13.40	50.98
		4	Ciacova	57.80	8.34	31.54
		5	Deta	37.03	14.90	35.18
		6	Grădiște	24.14	3.79	60.47
		7	Lipova	60.94	4.81	29.81

Order No.	DISTRICTS	No.	CIRCUMSCRIPTION	Roumanians	Magyars	Germans
		8	Modoş.	24.90	17.78	32.43
		9	Recaş.	53.09	12.61	19.45
		10	Sânnicolaul-Mare. .	29.16	5.95	43.03
		11	Vinga.	31.67	12.24	35.48
21	Trei-Scaune	1	Aita-Mare	22.87	76.17	0.52
		2	Chezdiu.	7.46	92.31	0.02
		3	Covasna	16.92	81.53	0.12
		4	Sf. Gheorghe . . .	35.33	63.77	0.16
22	Turda-Arieş	1	Câmpeni	99.52	0.17	0.03
		2	Iara-de-Jos.	80.96	17.82	0.07
		3	Ludoşul-de-Mureş .	70.73	24.11	0.05
		4	Trăscău.	77.36	22.02	0.04
		5	Turda.	69.54	27.42	0.04
		6	Vinţul-de-Sus. . . .	65.61	33.14	0.05

In this table we see that out of a total of 152 circumscriptions, the Roumanians have an absolute majority in 107, the Magyars in 20, and the Germans in 5.

Out of 4.082 communes, the total number of communes in Transylvania, the Roumanians have an absolute majority in 2.918 (73.92%), the Magyars in 737 (18.2%), the Germans in 266 (6.50%), and other nationalities in 65 (1.56%), as will be seen in the following table.

TABLE No. 4

DISTRICT	Number	THE ABSOLUTE MAJORITY IS WITH THE.....				THE RELATIVE MAJORITY IS WITH THE....			
		ROUMANIANS	MAGIAR	GERMANS	OTHERS	Roumanians	Magyars	Germans	Others
Alba-de-Jos..	174	157	12	3	1	—	1	—	—
Arad	216	186	18	5	—	2	1	2	—
Bihor.....	431	344	74	1	7	1	3	1	—
Bitsrița-Năsăud.	97	65	4	25	1	2	—	—	—
Brașov.....	23	3	10	9	—	—	—	1	—
Caraș-Severin .	358	302	6	19	27	2	—	2	—
Ciuc	63	6	56	—	—	—	1	—	—
Cojocna.....	238	192	41	3	—	—	1	1	—
Făgăraș	85	84	—	—	—	—	—	1	—
Hunedora ...	425	417	5	—	—	3	—	—	—
Maramureș..	56	42	3	—	7	2	—	—	2
Mureș-Turda.	204	81	110	3	—	5	5	—	—
Odorheiu ...	135	3	129	3	—	—	—	—	—
Sălaj	239	182	54	—	2	7	6	—	—
Sătmar.....	221	163	29	16	—	7	6	—	—
Sibiu.....	86	62	—	19	—	4	—	1	—
Solnoc-Dobâca .	312	285	19	2	—	4	1	1	—
Târnava-Mare..	123	45	9	61	—	3	—	5	—
Târnava-Mică ..	116	60	32	21	—	2	—	1	—
Timiș-Torontal.	241	115	14	96	18	10	1	5	2
Trei-Scaune.	101	10	90	—	—	1	—	—	—
Turda-Arieș .	139	114	22	—	—	1	2	—	—
	4.083	2.918	737	266	65	49	23	21	4
		9392%	1802%	6.50%	1.56%				

Out of the 184.340 Jews, 125.920 live in the towns aud only 58.420 in the villages.

They are chiefly scattered over the districts of Maramureș, where they constitute 23.85%, of the population, of Satu-Mare (7.46%), Bihor (5.83%), Bistrița-Nasaud (5.69%), and Solnoc-Dobâca (5.26%).

Towards the minorities, the Roumanian State has always observed from the beginning a tolerant and conciliating policy.

This policy which was dictated in the real interest of the consolidation of Greater Rouma-

nia, answered at the same to the natural feelings of the Roumanian nation.

Roumania has no need to persecute the minorities, for these minorities offer no danger for her. In truth Roumania is far from being in the position of former Hungary, where the Magyar element, was in a minority, and where the Government followed a policy in which the fundamental principle was »Hungary either must be Hungarian, or must perish«.

Roumania is a State in which the Roumanian element has a strong numerical preponderance, so she need not fear her minorities. On the contrary her obvious interest is to win them over. That is the reason why her constitution, as well as all her existing laws and regulations, make no differrence between. Roumanians, and those who do not belong to the Roumanian race ; all have the same rights aud duties. Art. 5 of the Roumanian constitution says »Roumanians, without any distinction of origine, language or religion, enjoy the same liberty of conscience, of education, liberty of the press, liberty of meeting, liberty of association, and all liberties and rights established by the laws.

We will see in the following chapters, the manner in which this equality of the liberties, and protection of the rights and duties of each individual is realized.

I.

The religion of the minorities in Transylvania

The minorities in Transylvania are divided, in a religions point of view, in the following manner :

Roman Catholics	958.651
Reformed church	719.651
Unitarians	74.192
Lutherans	261.751
Jews	184.340
Total	2.198.585

that is 42.99%, of the 5.113.124 inhabitants.

As regards the ecclesiastical administration, the Roman Catholics are divided into four dioceses, namely:

1) The diocese of Alba-Iulia with 241 parishes, and a congregation of 377.129 worshippers.

2) The diocese of Oradea-Mare with 50 parishes, and a congregation of 71.315 worshippers.

3) The diocese of Satu-Mare with 42 parishes, and a congregation of 71.315 worshippers.

4) The diocese of Temișoara with 155 parishes, and a congregation of 438.388 worshippers.

The reformed church have a bishopric in Cluj with 617 parishes, and a congregation of 476.253 worshippers, and 180 parishes with a congregation of 243.398 worshippers, not yet forming a separate bishopric, but which during the Magyar rule, were under the jurisdiction of the reformed church Bishop of Debreczin, situated in Hungary of today.

The Unitarians have a bishopric in Cluj, with 112 parishes, and a congregation of 74.192 worshippers.

The Lutherans are chiefly Saxons; and depend on the bishopric of Sibiu.

The other 38.276 are Lutheran Magyars, who, under the Hungarian rule, depended on the Bishops of Nyiregyhaza and Budapest, and who have not succeeded to this day in creating for themselves a definite organization, for the reason that some of them wanted to pass under the jurisdiction of the Bishops of Sibiu, while the others wished to constitute an independent ecclesiastical organization having a Magyar character.

The Jews have altogether 142 communities, with several branches, out of which 92 are doctrinaires, 23 neologs and 6 statu quo.

Although the greater part of the leading staff of the religions of the minorities in Transylvania, namely the Bishops and Priests, had, under the Magyar rule, and especially during the world's war (1914—1918) an openly provoking attitude, towards the Roumanian population, though they had been the chief contrivers of the policy of denationalization, begun and followed up with persistance, and without scruple by the Hungarian Governments, and although the very organisation of those religions, proved an obvious tendency for weakening and destroying the Roumanian element, Roumania has been the only State, increased by the war, who brought no attaint to the staff or the organization of the different worships.

The Roumanian Government removed no Bishop or Priest, and suppressed no parishes; as it did not wish to inaugurate the Roumanian rule, by deeds of revenge or retaliation, even if they were justified. No measures were taken for repression, even when the Bishops and a part of the clergy of the minorities, struggled openly and by all the means in their power

to prevent the union of Transylvania to Roumania.

During the Paris Conference, the three Magyar bishops, Gustav Maylath (roman catholic), Karol Nagy (reformed church) and Josef François (unitarian) led a strenuous campaign against Roumania in Holland, Switzerland, England and Austria, through their emissaries.

Bishop Karol Nagy used as his emissary a man named Alexander Boer, trustee of the reformed church in Transylvania, while Bishop Josef François made use for the same object, of his vicar Georges Boroș.

On September 6-th 1919, these three Bishops addressed to the Counsel of five at the peace Conference, an appeal in which they pronounced most violent insults against the Roumanian nation.

On September 16-th 1919, the Bishops Karol Nagy, François Josef, and the Lutheran priest Gustav Kirchknopf, addressed a new appeal to the protestants in the whole world against the union of Transylvania to Roumania.

On October 24-th 1919, the suffragan of the uniate bishopric of Cluj, G. Boroș, sent by his chief to Holland and England, handed Mr Samuel A. Elliott, president of the American Uniate Association, a memoir, in extremely violent terms, in which he claims a foreign intervention against the Roumanians.

On November 25-th 1919, Bishops Karol Nagy and Alexander Boer sent to their co-religionists in the Western countries, a memoir, where they expound the danger which would threaten protestantism, if Transylvania was united to Roumania. This memoir ends with the following words :

»*Christian brothers, the reformed church of*

»*Transylvania, is on the brink of the abyss, and* »*appeals to you. If we are torn away from Hun-* »*gary, to be hurled as a prey to a nation of an* »*inferior culture, if Hungary, which we have de-* »*fended for a thousand years, is dismembered,* »*there will no longer be peace, for you will have* »*created a ruthless irredentism, and a new* »*Alsace-Lorraine, much more fatal than the* »*other. As for us we will die on the breach, but* »*we will not give in*«.

The Roumanian Government had full cognizance of these memoirs, and of the whole subversive propaganda directed against the kingdom, and the Roumanian nation; in spite of all this it maintained in their sees, the Bishops Mavlath, Nagy Karoly and François Josef, and M^r^ Boros has been free to return to Cluj, where he continues in his office of suffragan of the Uniate Bishopric, and draws his salary which he receives from the Roumanian Government, and neither he nor the above named bishops ever suffered the slightest annoyance.

The activity of the Magyar bishops, did not remain merely within the limits of this propaganda abroad. Inside the country they persisted a long time, in refusing, by the customary oath, taken before the Chief of the State to prove their readiness to respect, in their official duties, the laws of the land, and to bring no attaint against public order, and the surety of the State. The only measure taken by the Government against this attitude was to refuse paying the salaries of the priests. When the Government informed the Hungarian Lutheran priests, who had no Bishop in Roumania, and whose situation therefore could not depend on the Bishop's attitude, that their salaries would

be paid, if they sent in the proper documents required by the existing laws, to justify that they were entitled to receive that salary from the State, the priest Gustav Kirchknopf of Cluj, who had set himself up as a kind of leader, sent them a circular note on July 2-nd 1920 (under No. 51) exhorting them to pass to the order of the day as regards the Government's intentions, as they will all receive their salaries, thanks to certain secret funds, called *»guarantee fund«* (Totàllàsi alap).

The Government was informed very precisely about this circular note but in its desire for peace, it took no notice.

The Bishops and the heads of the Hungarian clergy wanted to prevent at any price, the population from remaining under the impression, that the new state of affairs, created by the war, would be permanent. Their intention was to keep up the discontent amongst their flock, and to destroy the moral equilibrium so necessary for maintaining peace.

This tendency was uttered in an edifying manner by the former Roman catholic Bishop of Timişoara, Glattfelder at a conference held in Alba-Iulia on October 15-th 1922, on the day of the coronation of our King.

Some chiefs of the popular catholic union, had presented themselves that day before Bishop Glattfelder in order to beg him to countenance the organization of the »Union« in his diocese. Bishop Glattfelder answered them: *»I have no confidence in the popular catholic »union, for its object is to calm the spirits, and to »consolidate the country. I am not for such an activity, which would strengthen the Roumanian »rule over these provinces: I am, on the contrary »for a passive attitude, and for an action which*

»would produce, by all possible means, discontent »and hatred towards the Roumanian State, so »that it may crumble and that milleniary Hun»gary, whose citizen I consider myself to be, may »rise up again in this place«.

The Roumanian Government not only maintained in office the whole ecclesiastical staff of the minorities worships, but also left their organisation intact. All the minority religions enjoy the completest liberty and the largest autonomy in administering their internal interests, without any kind of interference on the part of the State. In fact the Constitution provides in art. 22 the guarantee of an equal liberty and protection for all worships *).

("UNIVERSAL CATHOLIC WEEKLY« OF MAI 27 1921).

ROUMANIA AND TRANSYLVANIA

I notice that much of your valuable space hass been taken up lately with the treatment of Transylvanian Catholics by the Roumanians, and I have asked for information both at the Secretariate of State and at the Roumanian Legation to the Holy See. *The statement published on May 14 by »The Times« is substantially correct,* Any trouble which there may have been seems now to be ended, the Bishops taking the oath of fidelity to the Roumanian King. There is no doubt that previous to that, the Bishops were, to say the least, hampered in the exercise of their ministry; but on the whole there is now little cause of complaint against Roumania. The Magyars in Transylvania have, by Peace Treaty, their language and national schools guaranteed to them. *As far as religious liberty is concerned, Roumania is the only nation which has not asked of the Holy See a »change« of Bishops in conquered or acquired territories. There has never been any question of substituting the Agyar Bishops in Transylvania by others.* At a certain period the political activity of the Bishops led to rather severe repression by the Roumanian Government. But when Bishop Maylath some months ago came to Rome *he was strongly urged by the Holy See to accept the new régime in his province.* He accepted the advice, and did not hesitate to call on the Roumanian Minister to the Holy See and to have dealings with him, *whereas till then he had communicated with the Hungarian Minister.*

The present recrudescence of exaggerated complaints against Roumanian policy in the new provicces is probably due to the impending ratification of the Trianon Peace Treaty in which the respective position of Hungary and Roumania is clearly defined. A formidable propaganda has been organised to oppose it, and as religious feelings are strong and easily stirred, special stress is laid on this aspect of the

question. But I am assured that at least since the Bishops took their oath of allegiance to the Roumanian King they have suffered no grave injustice. Anyhow, negotiations are at present going on between Rome and Roumania for the drawing up of a Concordat in which all religious questions, and their consequences for the different nationalities in the kingdom, will be carefully stated and decided. It is interesting to note that part of the Ortodox Church in Roumania has protested and declared its opposition to any Concordat with the Holy See, *but the Roumanian Government remains firm in its attitude of deference towards the Holy See and in its desire to make an agreement with it.*

The various religions are organized and practiced in virtue of statutes established during the former Hungarian rule. The Saxon lutheran church alone has modified its fundamental statute, modification published in 1920 under No. 2315, without even taking the trouble of advising the Government beforehand. Likewise the Roman Catholic Bishopric of Alba-Iulia modified the regulation for administering its properties in 1922, without advising the Government, although the former regulation of 1915, had been submitted to the approval of the King of Hungary. We shall see further in what these modifications consisted and how they prove, above all, a state of mind, which is not void of interest.

Let us first examine the statute of organization of the Saxon Lutheran church. The former statute provided under art. 4, the State's supreme right of control. This article has been suppressed in the new Statute.

The former statute provided, amongst the duties of the followers (art. 15), unshaken faith towards the Sovereign, and submission to the authority of the State. This disposition exists no longer in the new statute.

Likewise the former Statute contained a clause (art. 152), according to which, the laws of the country were to be observed in the com-

position of schoolbooks, this clause has also been suppressed in the new statute.

Article 168 of the former statute stipulated the obligation for the electoral Congress, immediately after the election of the new Bishop, to take the necessary steps, in view of his confirmation by the King. This categorical clause has been replaced by the following very vague formula: »As regards the eventual necessity of »the election being confirmed, the dispositions »of the existing laws will be carried out«.

The ancient statute provided, under art. 169, that the new Bishop was to take the oath of allegiance to the king, and obedience to the laws of the country, before the congress, specialy assembled for his instalment. The new statute has omitted this clause in the instalment ceremonial.

These are only a few instances of the modifications introduced by the Saxon Lutheran church to its statutes; they seem however to be enough to show the spirit which inspired them. The regulations for the administration of the property of the Roman Catholic »Status« of Transylvania, approved by the King of Hungary on April 24-th 19, contained amongst others, the following clauses: each year shall be forwarded for the King's approval the budget for the year to come, and the balance sheet of the year that has passed (art. 3); for all expenses out side the budget, exceeding 40.000 kronen, the royal sanction was required (art. 4); In cases of purchase or of sale, when the price was over 80000 kronen the royal sanction was equally required (art: 7); as also in the case ot investments or constructions, when the price exceeded 80.000 kronen, for loans exceeding 40.000 kronen, etc., etc., (art. 9). All these pro-

visions have been suppressed in the new regulations.

Besides this the Roumanian State allows for the minorities worship in Transylvania all the material aid in its power, to enable it to fulfil its mission, not making any difference between the religion of the minorities and the national orthodox and uniate religions.

The Magyar Government allowed no salary for the priests; they were obliged to maintain themselves, out of the income of their parishes. After the law XIV of 1898 the State made up the parish income of the reformed Lutheran, Calvinist and Orthodox priests, having high class degrees, to 1.600 kronen, and of priests having lower class studies, to the annual sum of 800 kronnen.

The parish revenues intended for the payment owed to the Roman Catholic priests have likewise been completed under the terms of law XIII (1909). But the State paid a feeble sum to this fund, as the larger part of the contributions were supplied by proper funds kept up annually by the 700.000 kronen paid by the Roman Catholic, Bishops, Canons and Priests, and by the 1.200.000 kronen from the Roman Catholic church funds.

The Roumanian State has continued this system of completing the sums, but not to 1.600 and 800 kronen a year, but to 6000 lei for the priests having high class degrees, and 4200 lei for these possessing only inferior degrees. To this salary equally based for all the priests, without any distinction of religion, is added every 5 years an increase of 25% (in reckoning which are counted the years served under the Hungarian rule) over and above the allowances for high prices, and for those having a family. The

Roumanian State pays all these expenses, out of the public exchequer, without demanding any contribution, neither from Roman Catholic Bishops, Canons or church funds (as was provided in art. 1 of the law of 1909).

The Hungarian Government allowed no Bishops of whatever religion they were, any special pay, The Roumanian State, pays the Bishops of the minority religions, besides the salary they receive as priests, a monthly allowance of 600 lei.

The bishopric chanceries were kept up by the respective Bishops, without receiving any thing, or very little from the Hungarian Government. Today all their expenses are covered by the Roumanian State, although the staff of these offices has been considerably increased since the Roumanian rule: Thus for instance the chancery of the Roman Catholic Bishopric of Alba-Julia, had in 1918, according to th official records published by the Hungarian Government eight officials paid by the Bishop; today there are eleven employees, and two servants, all paid out of the Roumanian State budget.

The chancery of the reformed church bishopric of Cluj had in 1918 seven officials, to day it has 19 and 3 servant men, all paid by the State.

The chancery of the Lutheran bishopric of Sibiu had 11 employees and servant men, now there are 23 paid out of the State budget.

During the Magyar rule, the theological seminaries were kept up by the respective dioceses, which were obliiged to cover all the expenses of staff and material, as the State only aided very few of these, and to a very feeble extent. Today all the professors of the minority

Illinois State University Library

theological seminaries, have salaries equal to those of the assistant professors of the Roumanian universities. Besides this the seminaries receive subsidies for meeting their material expenses

It is even strange to remark that while the professors of the Central Seminary of Bucarest receive salaries on a basis of 1.600 lei, not counting the gradations and other additional allowances, the professors of the Roman Catholic, reformed church, and unitarian minority seminaries in Transylvania, receive salaries on a basis of 2.200 lei a month.

We must not forget that, as we saw higher, up, in pursuance of the terms of art. 1 of law XIII (1909), the Roman Catholic Canons were bound to contribute, in consideration of an annual allowance, to the fund for paying the salaries of the Roman Catholic priests. At present the Canons themselves receive monthly pay from the State. These monthly allowances are entered in the budget of the minister of Cult, and are no longer the proceeds, as formerly, of temporary subventions.

Therefore there is nothing to be surprised at, if in spite of the financial difficulties of the present moment, the Roumanian State, has entered in the budget for 1925, in the desire of aiding all the churches without any distinction, a sum of 44.877.821 lei, for the churches of the minorities in Transylvania whilst the Orthodox church, which alone numbers 13 millions out of 17 million inhabitants has an allowance only three times larger.

On the other hand, if one compares the part which weighs on each rate payer, out of the sums destined for each worship we would find.

For the	Orthodox church . .	Lei	10.14
» »	Roman catholic church	»	8.61
» »	Calvinist presbiterian.	»	16
» »	Unitarian	»	23
» »	Lutheran	»	15.57
» »	Mahometan	»	10

Therefore for the Orthodox religion, which is the religion of thirteen million inhabitants, the Roumanian rate payer bears a charge of 10.14 lei, whereas for the religions of a very small minority 3.200.000 inhabitants, he must support a much heavier charge.

Let us remember that the State has also given to the official staff of the churches of the minorities, the right of having a reduction of 50% on the railroad tarif, an advantage they did not enjoy in Hungary.

To make it still clearer how far the Roumanian State went, in its tolerance towards the churches of the minorities, we have only to show the situation of the different religious orders and congregations, which from a Roumanian point of view, seems quite abnormal. There are in Roumania 12 religious orders and congregations (monks and nuns); the greater part of these keep up their hierarchical ties, with the Hungarian mother houses, not being willing to adapt themselves to the new state of affairs, and to proceed to a new organization. Thus the jesuits have their provincial chief in Budapest. The Piarists of the dioceses of Timişoara and of Satu-Mare, kept, till the beginning of this year, their provincial also in Budapest, where is also the provincial of the franciscans of the dioceses of Oradea Mare and Satu Mare; while the Franciscans of the diocese of Timişoara have theirs at Cyöngyös Hungary. The

fathers of the misericorde have their provincial at Budapest as also the sisters of St. Vincent de Paul of the dioceses of Timişoara and of Alba-Iulia ; the sisters of the order of the Cross are dependent on the mother house in Zsombok, (Hungary) etc.

Considering the state of the spirits in Hungary, and the feeling of the Hungarian population towards Roumania, one can easily fancy the inspirations these religious orders and congregations, receive from their Magyar chiefs in Budapest and other Hungarian towns.

Notwithstanding all this, the Roumanian Government never took any steps to oblige these orders and congregations, to break off their hierarchical ties with Hungary, and to organize themselves within the scope of the new state of affairs.

II

The instruction of the minorities in Transylvania

With regard to public teaching we must acknowledge that between the Roumanian State and Hungary there exist deep differences of conception.

In Roumania this question has always been and remains before all, a State problem; in Hungary only since some time, and under certain forms, is it looked upon in that light.

According to the terms of law XXXVIII of 1868 on lower school teaching, and of law XXX of 1883, on upper school teaching, the State, the Commune, the religious congregations, associations, and even private persons could found lower and upper schools, throughout the whole Hungarian territory.

The Hungarian State had reserved at the same time as a right of control, the right of establishing a minimal programme of teaching, taking part at the same time in the creation of the schools, when the private initiative of the congregations, of the commune, or of some other association had been lacking, and allowing subventions to the founders of the schools, who were not in a situation to support alone all the expenses; it is therefore not to surprise us if, out of 16.635 lower schools, which existed in Hungary before the war, only 3.051 were State schools, the others being church schools, communal schools, or schools kept up by private persons.

Likewise out of 215 upper schools only 74 were State schools, the others like the lower schools, were made up by the church schools, communal schools, or those founded by associations or private persons.

Out of 532 civil schools only 189 were State schools.

The different Hungarian Governments have given the importance of a question of State, to the teaching being given out in the Hungarian language, in the schools of the minorities, and to the patriotical education of the pupils.

These are the objects aimed at by: the law XVIII of 1879, which introduced the compulsory study of the Magyar language in all the lower and normal schools: the law XV of 1891, concerning baby schools and normal schools: the law XXVI of 1893 which determines the salaries of the schoolmasters professing in the church schools and the communal schools; and the same intention is followed up in the famous law XXVII of Count Albert Apponyi which provides categorically under art: 18, as follows:

»*in the lower, schools, where the teaching is not carried on, in Hungarian, be they subventioned or not by the State, the Magyar language must be taught in such a manner, that the non Magyar pupils, after having attended four years, should be able to express their thoughts correctly, in the Magyar language, both viva voce as well as in writing*«.

One may criticize the conception of the Roumanien State as to instruction, but one cannot detect any hostile tendency towards the minorities, for this conception was not inspired in the least by the necessities of the present, and goes back to a time when the problem of the minorities did not exist in Roumania.

The population of Transylvania, both minoritary as well as Roumanian, entered the organization of the Roumanian State, imbued with the old fangled conception which was current in Hungary. A clash between these two views therefore was, so to say inevitable.

But on this point also the Roumanian Governments did not prove refractory, and made great concessions to the old conception, by allowing all the schools, the benefit of acquired rights; in other words the State recognized their right of delivering valid diplomas of studies, like the State schools.

It could not do more, and now it no longer consents to give any subsidies to the church schools, or to schools kept up by associations or private persons.

The clash between these two, opposite ideas, had as a principle consequence to cause much prejudice to the Roumanian church schools, as on the one hand, like the others, they receive no more subsidies from the State, and on the other hand, the zealous Roumanians, who, in

the time of the Magyar sway made considerable sacrifices for keeping them up, less on account of their religious character, than because they were Roumanian, did not care to help the schools, now, that the free use of their language is no longer in danger.

The church schools of the minorities have had less to suffer from this conflict between the two conceptions, as we see that, since January 1-st 1919, their number not only has not diminished, but on the contrary, as we shall see lower down, has considerably increased.

Besides the consequences arising naturally out of this conflict, which the conception of the Magyar State and the conception of the Roumanian State in the public instruction problem, provoked, the schools of the minorities and more especially the Magyar schools in Transylvania, underwent important modifications.

We pointed out at the beginning of the memoir, that out of 5.113.124 inhabitants in Transylvania and the neighbouring districts joined to Roumania, the nationalities are divided in the following manner.

Roumanians . . .	2.930.120	57,50 %
Magyars	1.305.753	25,53 %
Germans (Saxons and Souabes)	534.427	10,45 %
Jews	184.340	3,60 %
Ruthens, Serbes etc. .	158.484	2,92 %

Notwithstanding the prevailing number of the Roumanian element, out of the total number of 5342 lower schools, which existed at the time of the Magyar sway, there were 2 392 Roumanian schools, 2.593 Magyar schools, and 267 German schools. Out of 117 civil schools, only 3 were Roumanian, 109 were Magyar and

5 German. Out of the 66 upper schools, the Roumanians had 5 (one of which only had 4 classes, while the Beius school, though built and kept up by the Roumanian Uniate Bishopric of Oradea-Mare, was magyarized by violence), the Magyars 52, and the Germans 9.

Out of 23 commercial schools, only one was Roumanian, 22 were Magyar.

Out of 35 normal schools, 8 were Roumanian, 24 Magyar and 3 German. The 10 industrial schools were all Magyar.

We see from the above statement that the Roumanians who represent 57,50 % of the population possessed 40,94 % of the lower schools; 2,65 % of the civil schools; 7,57 % of the upper schools; 4 34 % of the commercial schools; 2 2,6 % of the normal schools, and had no industrial school. Whereas the Magyars who represented 25,23% of the population, had 44,21 % of the lower schools, 93.16% of the civil schools, 78.78 of the upper schools, 95.66% of the commercial schools, and 68,57% of the normal schools.

Out of 2.585 Magyar lower schools, 1.497 were State schools; also out of 109 Magyar civil schools, 66 were State schools; out of 72 Magyar upper schools, 25 were State schools; out of the 22 Magyar commercial schools 13 were State schools, and out of the 24 Magyar normal schools, 10 were State schools.

For the Roumanians, there was no State school with the Roumanian language for teaching.

The pitious state, the Roumanian instruction in Transylvania, was reduced to, as a consequence of the policy adopted by the Hungarian Governments, stands out still more strikingly, jf, taking as a starting point the statistical data

quoted above we come to the conclusion that under the Magyar domination, there were, in that province.

1 Magyar lower	school	for every		503 Hungarian	inhabitants
1 Roumanian	»	»	»	1.233 Roumanian	»
1 Magyar civil	»	»	»	27.063 Magyar	»
1 Roumanian	»	»	»	983.366 Roumanian	»
1 Magyar upper	»	»	»	25.110 Magyar	»
1 Roumanian	»	»	»	586.024 Roumanian	»
1 Magyar commercial	school	»	»	59 352 Magyar	»
1 Roumanian	»	»		2.930.129 Roumanian	»
1 Magyar normal		»		54.406 Magyar	»
1 Roumanian	»	»		368.762 Roumanian	»

There is therefore nothing to be surprised at if a proportion of hardly 29.90 % of the Roumanian population knew how to read and write, while the rest was left in a complete State of ignorance.

It is naturally quite clear that such a situation, abnormal in the extreme, could not be tolerated by the Roumanian authority.

It did not touch the church schools, but the State schools passing into the hands of the Roumanian State, could no longer continue to be institutions for the denationalization of the Roumanian element. Those which were in the middle of a Roumanian population, were transformed into Roumanian schools, whereas only those situated in localities inhabited by Magyars remained Magyar. In this manner, out of 1.688 lower schools, belonging to the State, 1.020 or 60.40 %, are today Roumanian 562, or 33.28 % are Magyar, while the remaining 106 (6.32 %) is divided amongst Germans, Jews, etc.; out of 72 civil State schools, 44, (51 %) are Roumanian, 20 (27.77 %) are Magyar and 8 are German. Out of 42 State upper schools, 33 have become Roumanian, 7 are Magyar and 12 German. Out of 15 State commercial schools, 10 are Roumanian and 5 Magyar; of course,

as was natural, these changes produced a certain excitement amongst the Magyar population, as is always the case after a radical reform, but it was just as natural on the part of the Roumanian Government, to take no notice of these susceptibilities of the Magyar minority, which were quite unjustified, and not to go on encouraging this policy of denationalizing the Roumanian element in the schools, inaugurated under the Magyar regime.

As we observed at the beginning of this chapter, the question of education in Roumania was and is still looked upon under the light of a State problem. But the Government, while keeping the upper hand in matters of public instruction, without leaving them to be cared for by the congregations, societies and private persons, has avoided bringing any attaint to the rights of the churches, which consisted in creating and keeping up their own schools, the choice of the language for teaching in, being left to the ecclesiastical authorities.

As a consequence of this complete liberty the church schools of the minorities, took a development, unequaled heretofore, as is illustrated by the figures of the following statistical table.

Lower schools a) Roman Catholic	The Bishopric of	OWNED		DIFFERENCE	
		in 1818	today	in plus	in minus
	Timişoara .	77	81	4	
	Satu Mare . .	44	45	1	
	Oradea Mare .	71	71	0	
	Alba-Iulia . .	185	228	43	
	Total . .	377	426	48	

Lower Schools Reformed Church	The Bishopric of	OWNED		DIFFERENCE	
		in 1818	Today	in plus	in minus
	Cluj	177	490	313	
	Diocese having no Bishop	185	194	9	
	Total . .	362	684	322	

In 1918 the Lutheran Saxons owned 258 lower church schools, today they have 268, that is 10 more ; the Magyar Lutherans had 4 in 1918, today they have 14. The Unitarians had in 1918, 27 church lower schools, today they have 44. that is 18 more. On the whole in 1918, there were in the territory which belongs to day to Roumania 1028 lower church schools, of the minorities. To day after 6 years of Roumanian domination, there are 1435, that is an increase of 407 schools ; to this figure me must add : 561 Magyar speaking, lower schools of the State, — 51 German speaking schools, 55 Jewish schools serb schools etc. ; all this will give an exact idea of the minoritary lower school education in Transylvania, under the new regime.

Allowing for the comparative value of the figures, let us remark simply that under the Hungarian regime from 1913 to 1918, the number of Roumanian lower church schools fell from 2655 to 2392.

The minority churches keep up lower schools, even in the localities where the number of the congregation is on a diminishing scale, and keep them up, evidently with the intention of preventing the children from going to the State schools.

Thus, the Roman Catholic diocese of Oradia Mare keeps up a lower school at Suplac (district of Bihor) which has 23 pupils, another at Metenția (district of Salaj) with 15 pupils, another at Crasna-Rece, with 11 pupils, and another at Gibau with 22 pupils.

The Roman Catholic diocese of Alba-Julia keeps up the lower school of Vimul de Jos with 24 pupils, — of Ighiu with 14 pupils — a school at Bucium for 21 pupils another at Abus for 19 pupils, and another at Hususeu for 21 pupils. The reformed church keeps up the following schools; a new school at Livada with 23 pupils; — at Șard with 11 pupils; — at Ardusat with 13 pupils; — at Gioroc with 13 pupils; — at Pauca with 12 pupils; at Rau-Barbat with 8 pupils: — at Lupeni and Pesteana with 10 pupils; at Roportul-Mare and Turdas with 11 pupils, and finally at Canas, with 7 pupils and Sanca, with 9 pupils. The lutherans keep up a school at Giacos with 9 pupils; — another at Cusma with 5 pupils; — and another at Sogig, with 17 pupils; — and one at Mghindoae with 15 pupils. In order to be able to suffice to keeping up such a number of schools, and especially to keep the pupils aloof from the State schools, where the language for studies, is in all cases the Hungarian language, the Bishops and the clergy of the minority worships, display an astonishing activity, in laying on their followers taxes which they can support with difficulty. Objections are continually formed by the latter by which they demand the intervention of the State, urging that they do not intend to pay excessive taxes for the benefit of a church school in the commune where there is at the same time a Magyar State school where the teaching is gratuitous. Best-

des this, the congregation, is made to pay school taxes by the churches of the minorities in the communes where there are no church schools. Notwithstanding the complaints addressed by the latter to the authorities, on the subject of this excessive taxation, the State has always abstained from interfering so as not to produce the impression that it would be wishing to baulk the churches, in their right of founding and of keeping up schools.

The progress made by minority church instruction in Transylvania during these few years of Roumanian rule was not limited simply to creating lower schools, but the number of upper schools has likewise increased in an equal proportion.

Thus the Roman Catholics, who owned in 1918, 13 upper schools, have 17 today; — the reformed church which had 9, today have 11;— the unitarians who had 2, now have 3; — the Lutheran Saxons who had 9, now have 11.

In 1918 the Roman Catholics had 25 civil schools, and have 48 today; — the reformed church which had 3, now has 19; — the Unitarians which had none now have 2;—the Lutheran Saxons who had 5, have 8;—the Lutheran Magyars who had one, now have 2.

The Roman Catholics who only had one, Commercial school, have 4 today; the Lutheran Saxons who also had none, now have 3.

These figures show that under the Roumanian regime, the number of church upper schools of the minorities has increased by 13;— of civil schools by 46, and of Commercial schools by 10, withal the keeping up by the State of 9 Magyar upper schools, 2 German ones, 22 Magyar civil school, 8 German ones and 6 Magyar commercial schools.

Such is the real situation of the minority instruction in Transylvania, founded on true figures, which defy any unjust construction.

III

Social and economical life of the minorities in Transylvania

The minorities in Transylvania, and more especially the Magyar minorities, have continued to display, even since the return of this province to the Kingdom of Roumania, a social and economical activity as intense as it is fruitful, as will be seen on the examination of the statistical data, which we reproduce lower down. In spite of the moral crisis, very, easy to be understood, under the circumstances, through which our minorities passed, during the first few years which followed the conclusion of the peace, they were not long over picking themselves up, and gaining considerable ground, both from a social as well as an economical point of view.

This result is easy to be understood, if we take into consideration that the Roumanian State, whose principal interest consisted, and still consists in the rapid and lasting consolidation, of public life taken as a whole, not only, never brought any obstacle to the march of this progress, but, on the contrary always endeavoured, by all the means in its power, to smooth down all difficulties.

All the laws and the old regulations existing under the Hungarian rule, before December 1st 1918 have been maintained, although amongst them many were found to have been

concieved in view of certain objects, and showed tendencies directed against the non Magyar elements; as to the new laws and regulations, which exist since the establishment of the Roumanian rule, they are all inspired in a broad democratical spirit, imposed by the terms of the Constitution, which as we observed in the introduction to this memoir, provides in art: 5 that all Roumanian citizens, without distinction of origin, language or religion, will enjoy liberty of education, liberty of the press, liberty of meeting and liberty of association.

The Roumanian Government has proved its tolerance towards the social cultural organizations of the minorities, to an extent which could not easily be exceeded, as by the law on juridical persons, promulgated at the beginning of the year 1924, which recognizes the quality of juridical persons, of all the organizations existing at the time when the law was promulgated. (art: 2).

The Minister of justice, author of the law, expounding the terms of art: 2 in his speech before the Chamber of Deputies, in its sitting of January 31st 1924, said textually: *»In art: 2. »I have respected the rights already proved. and »have declared that all juridical persons, existing »at the time, shall continue their activity as here»tofore, in virtue of the statutes, decrees, laws or »regulations ruling them at their creation. Do »you realize exactly the extent of this law ? It »means the recognition of all associations and »foundations declared as juridical persons thro»ughout the whole territory of the annexed provin»ces, by deeds enacted by the foreign authorities »under which they had been living«.*

What will show more effectually the progress realized by the minorities, in their social and

economical life is the fact that, the Magyar regime, and generally the upper classes in Hungarian public, life, professed the opinion that the Roumanian element was to be held down in a state of cultural, social and economical inferiority, so as to offer less danger to »Milleniary Hungary« as the author Eber Ernö puts it in his book »*Fajak harca A datoc az erdelyi nemzetisegi Kerdeshez*«. (The struggle of the races, contribution to the minorities problem in Transylvania) published in Budapest in 1905, and in which at page 3 we may read the words that: »*first we ought to famish the nationalities, leaving them to be tamed later on.*«

Consequently both the State and the Hungarian Society, were striving by all means in their power, and in all directions to accaparate the whole of public life in Transylvania: commerce, industry, public functions, towns, finances, etc., for the benefit of the Magyar element.

The result arrived at was that hardly 29 % of the Roumanian population knew how to read and write, and that out of the aggregate of the urban population which amounted to 668.700 inhabitants, the Roumanians were only 126.150 (18.89 %. Likewise out of 1962 industrial concerns, only 371 (18.90 %) were Roumanian, and out of 1780 commercial concerns, only 468 (21.99 %) were Roumanian.

It is in the same manner likewise that we may explain the fact, that the Roumanians, although they represented a proportion of 16% of the population of Hungary only had 1.6% in Government offices. 3.1% out of the number of district representatives, 2.1% of the magistrates, 4.8 % of the barristers 2 % of the physicians. All the remaining charges formed the share of the ruling Magyar race, of the pri-

vileged »minority patriots«. This is why we must not be surprised if, under the Roumanian rule, the social and economical life of the minorities, which enjoyed the fullest liberty of association within the organized scope of the Roumanian State, such as we have described it above, should gain a development which the following figures will illustrate most eloquently.

a) *The Magyars*

In 1918, the Magyars of Transylvania owned 325 cooperative associations, and economical associations (the banks and the big industrial undertaking are not included in these figures) today they own 354, that is an excess of 29, having a number of 103.166 members, and a capital of 48.981.750 lei.

In 1918 they disposed of 106 cultural associations, to day they have 120, that is 14 more, with 18.152 members, and a capital of 2.547.379 lei.

In 1918 they owned 60 philanthropical societies, today they have 67 that is 7 more, with 16.325 members, and a capital of 352.070 lei.

In 1918 they had 28 religious associations, today they have 34, that is 6 more, with 4428 members, and a capital of 193.529 lei.

In 1918 they had 31 musical societies, today they have 37, that is 5 more, with 3.924 members, and a capital of 219.037 lei.

In 1918 they had 20 sporting clubs, today they have 30, that is 10 more with 23.768 membres, and a capital of 3.475.826 lei.

(B) *The Germans*

In 1918, the Germans (Saxons and Souabes) owned 417 economical and cooperative associations (the banks and the big industrial and commercial concerns are not included in these figures). Today they own 450, that is 33 in excess, with 81.761 members, and a capital of 13.039.087 lei.

In 1918, they disposed of 100 cultural societies: today they have 146, that is 46 more with 24.869 members, and a capital of 377.971 lei.

In 1918, they had 52 philanthropical societies; they have today 59, that is 7 more, with 24.412 members and a capital of 476.397 lei.

In 1918, they had 74 musical societies; today they have 101, that is 27 more with 9.355 members, and a capital of 200.100 lei.

In 1918, they had 14 sporting societies; to day they have 30 that is 16 more, with 3.964 members and a capital of 206.902 lei.

And to finish in 1918 they had 18 religious associations, to day they have 21, with 4.048 members and a capital of 369.310 lei.

It must be remarked that these figures were taken during the summer of 1.923 and apply to 19 districts out of 22, existing in Transylvania.

To complete the picture of the cultural and social life of the minorities in Transylvania, let us remember that the Magyars have 17 daily papers, 61 weekly reviews; 5 which come out several times a week; 24 monthly 12 forthnightly periodicals, in all 129, newspapers and reviews.

The Germans have 7 daily papers, 15 weekly reviews, 4 coming out several times a week 9

monthly and three forthnightly periodicals, that is 38 news papers and reviews.

It is not without interest to remark at the same time, that the Hungarians have in Transylvania 8 permanent theatrical companies which undertake artistical rounds in all the towns where the population is Magyar and which receive from the State very handsome help.

To settle the difference there is between the manner the Roumanian State acts towards the minorities, and that employed heretofore by the Magyar Governm nt, let us recall that between the interval from 1900 to 1910, the Roumanian journalists suffered 20 years and 4 months emprisonment, and have paid fines to an amount of 60.700 kronen (gold) for press offences.

* * *

Mr. Elemer Gyarfas a marking personality in Transylvania, head of the economical and financial section, of the Hungarian party having published in 1924 a monography on the study of the credit institutions of Roumania and on their relations with the Magyar banks of Transylvania, speaks in the following terms at page 19, concerning the Magyar banks: *»These institutions of credit, during the years »that have passed since 1918, after they broke off »the ties which bound them to the banks of Buda»pest, saw themselves reduced to their proper for»ces, and it is only thanks to the energy displayed »and to the activity and spirit of initiative of the »leaders, that they were able to conserve their in»dependance, and even realize remarkable pro»gress»*.

We have quoted the words of this Magyar

notability, because they express an opinion of an incontestable competence, which cannot be accused of partiallity.

Mr. Gyarfas'statements are the expression of the real truth, as we will see later on: but the remarkable progress realized by the Magyar finances, and to which he alludes, would have not been possible, however great the zeal and the ability displayed by its chiefs, if an essential condition, by which we mean, an entire liberty allowed by the State, had been missing.

The latest statistical reports, which we have received on the financial situation of the Magyar banks of Transylvania go back to the end of the year 1922. According to these reports the Magyars had, at that time, 197 banks (out of a total of 409 banks which could be counted in Transylvania, that is a proportion of 48,43%, if one considers that the Magyars represent 25,23% of the population) with a capital of their own of 364.255,174 lei, and an outside capital (deposits and credits) of 1.804.371.079 lei. The small commercial undertakings in Transylvania, have also taken a great development. To be convinced of this it will be enough to remember that in the interval from 1919 to 1922, that is during four years of the Roumanian regime, 35 important financial and economical institutions have been created in Roumania, and whose number goes on increasing. The situation of the financial and economical German institutions is not less flourishing. We will think it enough to mention as examples the three principal Saxon banks: 1) The »Hermanstädter Allgemeine Sparkasse« has increased its capital in 1918, from 1.500.000 kronen, to 20.000.000 kronen (10.000.000 lei). 2) The »Kronstädter Allgemeine Sparkasse«

with an initial capital of 2.514.000 kronen, has increased its capital to 7.214.000 kronen (1919), to 10.00).000 kronen (5.000.00 lei) in 1920, and to 10.000.000 lei in 1922. 3) The »Bodenkreditanstalt« increased its capital of 200.000 kronen to 10.000.000 kronen in 1919, in June 1919 it increased this capital to 20 000.000 kronen (10.000.000 lei), in 1920 this capital was increased to 14.000.000 lei, and in 1922 to 25.000.000 lei. The 42 Saxon banks in Transylvania, put together showed in 1912 a capital of their own of 40.225.000 kronen, and an outside capital of 374.437 kronen, whereas in 1922, the three banks mentioned above alone owned 65.021.410 lei capital of their own, and 318.787.849 outside capital.

We think that these figures speak for themselves.

IV

Discontent of the minorities

In the preceding chapters, we have illustrated by means of figures, the ecclesiastical, educational, social and economical situation of the minorities in Transylvania, compared to the situation which existed under the Magyar rule.

The conclusions to be drawn by strict logic, dictated by the value of the figures set forth, is obvious: the minorities enjoy a complete liberty, to the greater benefit of a conscious and fruitful activity.

In spite of all this, there is not an international congress not a meeting of the S. D. N, no European newspaper offices, which are not beset by petitions, pamphlets and publications of all kinds stating the complaints of the Magyar

minority in Roumania which cry out urbi et orbi, that it is persecuted, that it cannot live its life, that the Roumanian regime threatens its very existence, etc.

After having allowed the figures to speak for themselves in their strict and impartial eloquence, we think that a serious examination of these complaints might be useful.

In what concerns the Magyars, we can perfecly undestand their discontent. To ask them to be satisfied on the morrow of the situation created by the war, would be wanting too much, and knowing very little of human psychology, for they, as the German, born in Alsace-Lorraine, become a French citizen, or the German of Posen, annexed to Poland, the Magyar of Transylvania, cannot rejoice in the new state of affairs.

Thir feeling is quite natural and again we repeat we understand it perfectly. The sentimental crisis the Magyar element of Transylvania is going through, renders it extremely touchy and prone to criticize all that is done, and goes on in its new country.

Each step forward towards consolidation, each progress realized by the State in its task towards normalization, represents for him the crumbling of an illusion, one chance less in the hope he fosters of seeing the country weakened, and Transylvania again returning to the domination of Budapest.

Another cause of exasperation for the present Magyar generation in Transylvania, is to sit and look on powerless, at the collapse of public life, which had only been artificially set up in past times, by the Hungarian regime, with the evident aim of imposing the Magyar culture and national life.

As we have seen in the foregoing chapters, although the Magyar element in Transylvania represents barely 25.53% of the whole population, still all the lower, upper, civil, mathematical, industrial, commercial and normal schools of the State were Magyar, likewise the public State officials and the district agents, were Magyars in a proportion of 90%, while on the contrary the Roumanian element which represents 57% of the population was constrained by means of taxes, although they contributed to maintain their own schools of all grades, to contribute also for keeping up the Magyar culture in Transylvania.

Before 1919, the whole of the public life in that province; justice, administration, finance, railways etc, was exclusively Magyar.

It naturally followed that this Magyar character artificialy stamped on the public life, in a province where the Magyar element was in minority, was bound to disappear at the same time as the regime, which kept it on by all the means in its power, and in every direction. The reconstitution of public life in fair proportions is in course, and is gradually operating. But however careful one may be, to manage this transition from a factitious to a normal situation without a clash, the Magyar population gets immediately excited, and thinks itself persecuted and oppressed, when really it is only the peaceful solution of a natural and unavoidable action.

It is in this new situation, especially new for the present generation, that the principal cause of discontent of our Magyar fellow citizens resides.

We must however confess that besides these complaints which are rather of a sentimental

and psychological order, of which we have already spoken, the Magyar minorities of Roumania, have also formulated others of a more concrete nature. In this respect their complaints might be classed under three headings, namely: *a*) complaints against abuses commited by the authorities; 2) complaints against the agrarian reform; 3) complaints against the educational policy of the Roumanian Governments.

We will examine turn by turn these three orders of complaints, in a full spirit of equity and in an objective manner.

In respect of our administration in Transylvania, we own that there may be many short comings. We have pointed out in another chapter, that, out of the total number of public officials of the State, the Roumanians were in a proportion of barely 1.6%, and of 3.1% of the district agents. At the end of the year 1918, the Magyar officials, who had in hand all the public administration, nearly all abandoned their posts in a body, on instigations received from Budapest.

They thought that by acting in this manner the whole administrative edifice would collapse, and that the Roumanian regime, newly inaugurated, must perish under the blow of anarchy and rebellion.

Happily the hopes fostered in Budapest were not realized. The Roumanian authorities were capable of getting up in a hurry, a fresh administrative staff. Like all improvized matters, this administration presented certain shortcomings.

In many functions whose officials should have been recruited amongst persons having university degrees, it was necessary to appoint

others possessing only 6 to 8 upper school classes; and where the maturity degree was requizite, sometimes had to be appointed employees possessing only 2 or 3 classes. instead of gendarmes, formed in special schools and well disciplined, it was necessary to appoint soldiers returned from the front, and who had seen the revolution at very close quarters. In the tribunals where 15 to 20 magistrates had been in office, we were very glad at the beginning to be able to appoint 4 or 5.

The vacancies left by the Magyar officials, could not all be filled up with elements from the former kingdom, as there also the war had considerably thinned the ranks, — to such an extent that those remaining were only just sufficient, to answer the requirements.

Mistakes may have been committed, as we fairly acknowledged above, but it is completely false and unjust, to attribute those mistakes to an intentional policy of persecution against the minorities.

The invariable object of the Roumanian Government is, in fact, to introduce the necessary modifications, so as to make this administrative organization, more useful and more perfect day by day. No impartial observer could deny this truth.

* * *

As regards the complaints of the second order, directed against the agrarian reform, we must own that they are very easy to be understood. Those whose domaines have been expropriated, are for the most part deeply dissatisfied, but on the other hand the large popular masses, without distinction of language or religion, have profited by the agrarian reform, and enjoy a no lesser satisfaction.

To understand this matter, one must know from the beginning, that the agrarian reform, both in the former kingdom and in the new provinces, answered to a vital need of the Roumanian State.

80% of the population being represented by the peasant element, Roumania was troubled by a deep social and economical ill feeling, so long as this element had no land, and remained in a most precarious material situation. That is why the application of this reform could not be put off any longer, without risking to shake the existence of the Roumanian State, in its very foundations.

In the second place what we must strongly underline is, that the agrarian reform was not inaugurated by cause of the annexation of Transylvania, to strike at the minoritary element, but that this reform had formed the objet of political struggles in former Roumania for the last 20 years, and that at the time the world's war was declared, the Roumanian Parliament had just proceeded to the modification of the Constitution, in order to realize by means of expropriation the allotment, in favor of the peasants, of the large landed estates.

The agrarian reform is of a general order, and is applied as well in the former kingdom, as in the annexed provinces.

It is clear that in the former kingdom, the discontented ones are exclusively the expropriated Roumanian landowners, for the number of strangers does not exist. In Transylvania the most dissatisfied are the minoritaires, because they formed the great majority of those who owned the latifundia.

The following statistical reports, show to

what a great extent the agrarian reform was needed in Transylvania.

On the whole number of estates in that province, the small landowners were in a proportion of 99.01 % and owned only 58.75% of the land, whereas the big and the middling landowners who were in a proportion of 0.99%, owned in all 8.855.743 »arpents«, whereas 8.439 big and middling landowners owned 6.206.744 cadastral »arpents«, and more especially the estates exceeding 1.000 »arpents« amounted to 4.026.951 cadastral »arpents«.

Evidently this iniquitous repartition of property could not be maintained, for it constituted, at the same time as a social iniquity, a permanent cause of trouble and insecurity.

Therefore a reform was necessary, it was realized and applied in all its provisions, to all the landowners without distinction of origin, language or religion.

The Roumanians as well as the Magyars and the Germans, were dispossessed, in the same spirit and after the same rules, and it really is not the fault of the Roumanian Governments, if in Transylvania, the number of big Magyar and German landowners was higher than that of the Roumanian landowners.

The judgements that several Roumanians have pronounced, on the present Govermment, headed by Mr. Bratiano, in respect of the agrarian reform in Transylvania, prove sufficiently to what an extent the most severe impartiality presided the application of this reform.

The honorable deputy, Mr. Jean Jacob, reporter on the agrarian law, before the Chamber of Deputies, under the Averesco cabinet, in his book entitled » *The Agrarian question in Ardeal*« published in 1924, expresses himself in the fol-

lowing terms in the chapter entitled »*The mistakes of the present regime*«:

»*From the point of view of our national interests* »*the following mistakes have been committed dur-* »*ing the application of the agrarian law*:

1) »*On account of the expropriation operations,* »*the large Roumanian property, which existed in* »*Ardeal, has almost been done away with. If the* »*skill of the Government had been equal to the* »*circumstances, this property might have been sav-* »*ed, but this regime probably aimed at beating* »*all the records attained, of yore, by the Hunga-* »*rians. The result of which is that ve have no* »*more than 3% of the soil*«.

»*The Roumanian landowners were submited to* »*a rigourous expropriation, whereas the counts, the* »*barons, of Transylvania, these great magnates of* »*the land (all Magyars) have allready reconsti-* »*tuted their domaines by other means,—the time* »*will come when I shall publish some statistics, on* »*this sad state of affairs*».

2) »*By the manner in which the expropriation* »*operations were carried on, an obstacle has been* »*brought to the development of the large Rou-* »*manian property in Transylvania, by way of* »*evolution*«.

»*A more rational policy would have encouraged* »*and guided the agrarian evolution, in a na-* »*tional direction, so as to increase also in this* »*direction, the national heirloom. But our present* »*leaders did not understand this need*«.

»*Consequently the truth is that the agrarian* »*reform not only does not harm the minoritaire* »*element; but, on the contrary, it strengthens it,* »*for practically if it reduces the estates of a few* »*hundreds of Hungarian magnates, it gives land* »*to thousands of Hungarian peasants*«.

In other words the agrarian reform, trans-

forms a class of needy Hungarian proletarians intto a class of well off small Hungarian landowners.

* * *

On the complaints of the third order formed against the educational policy of the Roumanian Governement we have supplied sufficient information in the chapter entitled »*The instruction of the minorities in Transylvania*«.

We consider however that it would not be superfluous to come back on the matter with certain particulars.

As we explained in the chapter we mentioned, in this case the conflict arises between two conceptions diametrically opposed to one another : the democratical conception of most of the modern States, as contrasting with the middle age conceptions of certain political organisms, which still bear the stamp of past times strongly imprinted.

In Roumania the question of instruction, has always been considered as a State problem, in the strict sense of the word ; according to this, public instruction as a whole was in the hands of the State, and the public schools, that is the schools which had the right of delivering valid certificates, were without exception State schools.

It was the State which appointed and paid the teachers, which controled the teaching, and determined the programme for the studies, all the other schools were private schools. In Hungary, as we have already said another conception was prevalent. Public instruction was not in the hands of the State, but in the hands of the churches, of the communes, of associations and of private persons. The State being

content to found the schools, there, where private initiative had been lacking. That is the reason why, out of a total number of 16.635 lower schools existing in Hungary before the war, barely 3.051, or 18.34 %, were State schools ; as also out of 215 upper schools, only 74 or 34.41 %, were State schools ; out of 352 civil schools 198, or 37.21 %, were State schools. The State reserved simply the right of control and of inspection, the right of establishing a minimal programme of studies, and above all, as we saw above the right of magyarizing the non magyar populations.

After the union of Transylvania to the former kingdom, a clash between these two conceptions was bound to be provoked.

The conception of the Roumanian State, so different from the Magyar conception provoked in Transy vania a reaction of the minorities, but more especially of the Roumanians, accustomed to State schools, for the simple reason that there was not one, where Roumanian was the language of teaching, and that only the church schools and a few communal schools, understood that language. In front of the newly created situation and convinced in their view of the question, the minoritaires, as well as the Roumanians of Transylvania, began a campaign against the conception which reigns in the competent quarters of the ancient kingdom, and we must confess that those who strive most energetically for the triumph of their ideas are precisely the Roumanian religions, for the reason that the conception of the Roumanian State hits them more directly.

At any rate one thing is quite clear, and that is that this educational policy is followed by Roumania since more than 70 years, and that consequently one must be completely wanting

in good faith to assert that it was been adopted today with a view of bringing an attainder to the rights of the minorities.

The affirmation of the principles, which in the former kingdom serve as a basis, to public instruction, and which are also leading principles in the educational policy followed by the greater part of the modern democratical nations, cannot represent a tendency for oppresing the minorities, any more than the endeavours displayed for the practical application of those principles; and if is a great mistake to look at the matter in that light.

We must make allowances for the extreme susceptibility of our minorities, to which we have already alluded at the beginning of this chapter, in order to have the clue to their attitude.

The Governments of Bucarest however have given no proof of intractability with regard to the conceptions of the Transylvanians, and have consented to a series of concessions, of the greatest importance; thus they admitted the Statu quo, in allowing the churches the entire liberty of creating and keeping up their own schools, allowing also these schools a right of publicity.

The advantage which the churches and more especially those of the minorities, took of this liberty, and the development realized by their instruction during these few years of Roumanian sway, are illustrated by the figures we have reproduced higher up.

We have reason to hope, that we have sufficiently proved, what is the object of the complaints of the Transylvanian minoritaires, as well as the true meaning of their grievances and discontent.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
3 0112 119883301

D651.T8M[redacted]
C001
THE MINORITY QUESTION IN TRANSYLVANIA$ B
[redacted]
3 0711 11419 8084